Atty. Dkt. No.: 17937 (AT 20958-2090)

Remarks

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in the present application, of which claim 4 has

been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject therein, and to which claims 21-24

have been added. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject

matter.

Initially, it is noted that claims 19 and 20 were not acted on within the outstanding Office

Action. It is believed that the subject matter of claims 19 and 20 is neither anticipated nor

rendered obvious by the prior art of record.

Claims 1-9 and 11-18 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Wang et al (USP 6,296,495). Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Wang et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons

set forth hereafter.

It is submitted that the contact of Wang does not teach or suggest the claimed contact as

defined in claim 1. Claim 1 defines the contact to include a body having a central beam defining

and extending along a longitudinal axis of the body, with the longitudinal axis extending along a

surface of a first conductive member on which the body is placed. In contrast, Wang's contact 2

includes a vertically oriented junction portion 25 that is bifurcated upwardly and comprises a pair

of retention arms 251 at an upper side thereof. The junction portion 25 of Wang does not

resemble in any manner the claimed contact body of claim 1.

Claim 1 further defines the contact to have a contact portion joined to the body, and to

have a termination lead having a base end joined to the central beam of the body. The

termination lead has an opposite outer end configured to be fixedly secured to the first

conductive member. The termination lead extends laterally from the central beam at one of an

acute and right angle with respect to the longitudinal axis of the central beam. Wang's contact 2

8

has no such structure. Wang's contact includes a solder base 10 joined with a lower beam 23 and an upper contact beam 21, none of which have a termination lead joined thereto. The solder base 10 is configured to be soldered to a circuit board. The solder base 10 does not teach or suggest the claimed termination lead. Among other things, the soldering base 10 does not have a base end joined to a central beam of a contact body, nor an opposite outer end configured to be fixedly secured to a conductive member. The entire lower surface of the solder base 10 is joined to the circuit board. Further, the solder base 10 does not extend laterally from a central beam at one of an acute and right angle with respect to a longitudinal axis of a center beam (which is defined to extend along a surface of the first conductive member). Wang's contact 2 is simply not constructed in the claimed manner, and thus does not teach or suggest the claimed contact.

With regard to claims 3 and 5, Wang's solder base 10 does not include a base end formed integral with a side wall of a central beam, where the side wall bows to permit the termination lead to translate along a first axis of motion (claim 3). Nor does the solder base 10 include a plurality of termination leads extending laterally from opposite sides of a central beam in directions transverse to the longitudinal axis (defined to extend along a surface of the first conductive member) (claim 5).

Claims 6-8 further define features of the termination lead that are entirely absent from Wang's contact.

Regarding claim 9, Wang's contact 2 does not include a body with an end wall having opposite first and second edges where the first edge of the end wall is formed with an end of the central beam, while a second edge is formed with an end of a contact portion. Nor does Wang's contact include a contact portion in a central beam extending in a common direction from an end wall. The junction portion 25 is joined only to lower beam 23 which is then joined to the soldering base 10 which is then joined to the upper contact beam 21.

With regard to claim 10, applicant's strenuously traverse the obviousness rejection. The basis set forth in the obviousness rejection are not sufficient to constitute a prima fascia case of obviousness. In the outstanding Office Action, it is maintained that the instant invention allegedly "does not provide any reasons or specific problem to be solved by interleaving of the contact beams." There is no basis within the statutory or case law requiring that a patent application set forth a particular problem to be solved by a claimed invention. It is submitted that the requirements of 35 USC § 101 and 112, among others, are satisfied by the present application and that the structure of claim 10 is patentable subject matter and is properly supported.

The issue of whether an invention allegedly does or does not provide reasons or specific problems to be solved is irrelevant in establishing the basis for an obviousness rejection under 35 USC § 103(a). Therefore, this statement in the outstanding Office Action has no merit and lends no basis to establishing a prima fascia case of obviousness.

Further, the undersigned traverses the use of official notice with respect to the structure of claim 10. Claim 10 recites a specific feature, namely the use of a plurality of contact beams interleaved with one another and extending toward one another from opposites ends of a contact body. This structure is patentably distinct over conventional contacts and has advantages in terms of performance, cancellation of electromagnetic interference and the like. No conventional connector has ever been proposed that includes a plurality of contact beams, all within a single contact, aligned interleaved with one another. No conventional contact has been proposed having a plurality of contact beams, all within a single contact, extending toward one another from opposite ends of a single contact body. The undersigned objects to the summary dismissal of such unique structure in the outstanding Office Action. No reference has been shown having an interleaved contact beam configuration within a single contact. It is submitted that if such structure is so well known in the art as alleged in the outstanding Office Action, it would be quite simple for the examiner to produce at least one prior art reference showing such structure. In

Express Mail No. EV 459189483 US

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No.: 17937 (AT 20958-2090)

fact, the examiner has not done so. This simply highlights the fact that the claimed interleaved

configuration within a single contact is in fact not found in the prior art and in fact is not well

known. To rely solely on official notice for such a unique structure is entirely improper and the

outstanding rejection should be withdrawn.

Turning to claim 11, an electrical socket is recited having a housing configured to be

placed on a circuit board and to receive an electronic component. The socket further includes a

contact having a body with an end wall securely held in the housing. The end wall has opposite

first and second edges. The body includes a central beam formed at one end with the first edge,

and extending from the end wall along a longitudinal axis. The body includes a termination lead

formed with the central beam and extending transverse from the longitudinal axis.

termination lead has an outer end configured to be fixedly secured to the circuit board. The

termination lead flexes with respect to the body when the housing shifts with respect to the

circuit board. For reasons explained above, Wang's contact 2 does not have the claimed contact

structure, lacking among other things, the claimed end wall, the claimed central beam and the

claimed termination lead.

New claims 21-24 are believed patentable for reasons set forth above.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to

teach or suggest the claimed invention. Should anything remain in order to place the present

application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned

at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jay Hoette, Reg. No.: 50,666

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP

One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600

St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070

11